

Response

Applicant thanks Examiner Nguyen for reviewing proposed claim amendments faxed on June 15, 2007. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-22 have been rejected. Applicant has amended Claims 1-8, and 11-16. The following claim set 1-22 is herein presented for further examination.

35 USC §103 Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected by the Examiner as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 6,167,251) in view of Takatori, et al. (US PUB 2003/0078844). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Nonetheless, independent Claims 1 and 2 have been amended respectively to recite elements, for instance, the billing accounts providing control over the cost of non-essential usage and provide inexhaustible emergency communication “safety net” (support found in paragraphs [0007 – 0008] of the Specification) and providing a user an appropriate level of substantially free credit . . . responsive to detection of insufficient credit (support found in paragraphs [0046-0049] of the Specification), which elements Applicant believes are not disclosed in the cited references. Consequently, amended independent Claims 1 and 2 should have overcome this rejection and be in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 4 and 11-16 were rejected by the Examiner as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 6,167,251) in view of Takatori et al. (US 2003/0078844) and further in view of McConnell et al. (US 6,373,930). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Nonetheless, amended Claims 3 and 4 (with support found in paragraphs [0044] and [0046] of the Specification) and amended Claims 11-16, e.g., support for amended Claim 13 found in paragraph [0047] of the Specification] should have overcome this rejection based on their dependence on amended Claims 1-2 (discussed above). In summary, amended Claim 1-2 including elements such as billing accounts providing control over the cost of non-essential usage (with support found in paragraphs [0007-0008] of the Specification) . . . and providing a user an appropriate level of substantially free credit . . . responsive to detection of insufficient credit (with support found in paragraphs [0046-0049]) are believed not disclosed in the cited references. As such, amended Claims 3, 4, and 11-16 should have overcome this rejection and be in condition for allowance.

Claims 5, 7-9, and 17-22 were rejected by the Examiner as being unpatentable over Segal et al. (US 6,167,251) in view of Takatori (US 2003/0078844), and further in view of Fournies et al. (US 6,157,823). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Nonetheless, independent Claims 1 and 2 have been amended respectively (as discussed previously) to recite elements such as the billing accounts providing control over the cost of non-essential usage and provide inexhaustible emergency communication “safety net” (see paragraphs [0007 – 0008] of the Specification) and providing a user an appropriate level of substantially free credit . . . responsive to detection of insufficient credit (see paragraphs [0044] and [0046-0047]), which elements Applicant believes are not disclosed in the cited references. As such, amended Claims 5, 7, which depend on amended Claim 1, amended Claim 8, which depends on amended Claim 2, Claim 9, which depends on amended Claim 2, and Claims 17-22, which depend on amended Claim 1, should have overcome this rejection and be in condition for allowance.

Claims 6 and 10 were rejected by the Examiner as being unpatentable over Segal (US 2004/0201452 A1) in view of Takatori et al. (US 2003/0078844), and Fournies et al. (US 6,157,823) and further in view of McConnell et al. (US 6,373,930). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As discussed above, independent Claims 1 and 2 have been amended respectively to recite elements such as the billing accounts providing control over the cost of non-essential usage and provide inexhaustible emergency communication “safety net” and providing a user an appropriate level of substantially free credit . . . responsive to detection of insufficient credit, which elements Applicant believes are not disclosed in the cited references. As such, amended Claim 6 (with support from paragraph [0044] of the Specification) dependent on amended Claim 1, and amended Claim 10 dependent on amended Claim 2 should have overcome this rejection and be in condition for allowance.

Other Comments

Applicant hereby reserves the right to prosecute claims of different or broader scope in a continuation or divisional application.

Applicant notes claim cancellations or additions are made solely for the purposes of more clearly and particularly describing and claiming the invention, and not for purposes of patentability or overcoming any art.

The Examiner should infer no adoption of a position with respect to patentability, change in the Applicant's position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or acquiescence to any position taken by the Examiner, based on cancellations or additions.

Furthermore, any remarks made with respect to a given claim or claims are limited solely to such claim or claims.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments which may be resolved over the telephone, he is requested to call the undersigned at (310) 348-8195.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2007

By: 

Robert E. Kasody
Registration No. 50,268

Law Office of Robert E. Kasody
6601 Center Drive West, Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone No.: (310) 348-8195
Facsimile No.: (866) 449-3390